IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CARGLINA SOUTHERN DIVISION Case No. 7:21-cv-00104-M

STANLEY LORENZO WILLIAMS,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER
THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, et al.,)))	
Defendants.)	

This matter comes before the court on the memorandum and recommendation ("M&R") of United States Magistrate Judge Robert B. Jones, Jr. [DE 6] with respect to the initial screening of the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), Magistrate Judge Jones recommends that this court dismiss the Complaint as frivolous. Plaintiff timely filed an objection to the M&R as to "its entirety" [DE 8].

A magistrate judge's recommendation carries no presumptive weight. The court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the . . . recommendation[] . . . receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); accord Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 271 (1976). The court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.* § 636(b)(1). "However, the district court need not conduct de novo review when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations." Norris v. South Carolina, 18 F. App'x 171, 172 (4th Cir. 2001) (unpublished) (citing Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47–48 (4th Cir. 1982)). Absent a specific and timely objection, the court reviews only for "clear error" and

need not give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Even under the standards of liberal construction afforded to pro se filings, Plaintiff's objection does not identify any specific error in the M&R. Rather, Plaintiff objects to the M&R "in its entirety." DE 8 at 1. Plaintiff explains that the M&R has "fail[ed] to comply with the guidelines" and that he never would have consented to "Bad Law." Id. at 1–2. Plaintiff does not include any argument about the M&R's findings. De novo review, therefore, is unnecessary.

Upon careful review of the M&R and the record presented, and finding no clear error, the court ADOPTS the recommendation of the magistrate judge as its own. For the reasons stated therein, the Complaint is DISMISSED [DE 7]. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of November, 2022.

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE